



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

INCREASE OF PAY FOR THE COAST GUARD

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE
OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS,

FIRST SESSION

ON

P106-93

H. J. Res. 189 and H. R. 9204

OCTOBER 14, 1919



STANFORD
LIBRARIES

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1919

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

JOHN J. ESCH, Wisconsin, *Chairman.*

EDWARD L. HAMILTON, Michigan.

SAMUEL E. WINSLOW, Massachusetts.

JAMES S. PARKER, New York.

BURTON E. SWEET, Iowa.

WALTER R. STINESS, Rhode Island.

JOHN G. COOPER, Ohio.

HENRY W. WATSON, Pennsylvania.

FRANKLIN F. ELLSWORTH, Minnesota.

EDWARD E. DENISON, Illinois.

EVERETT SANDERS, Indiana.

SCHUYLER MERRITT, Connecticut.

J. STANLEY WEBSTER, Washington.

THETUS W. SIMS, Tennessee.

FRANK E. DOREMUS, Michigan.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky.

SAM RAYBURN, Texas.

ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Virginia.

CHARLES P. COADY, Maryland.

ARTHUR G. DEWALT, Pennsylvania.

JARED Y. SANDERS, Louisiana.

GEORGE ESCH, *Clerk.*

A. H. CLARK, *Assistant Clerk.*

CONTENTS.

Statement of—	Page.
Capt. Commandant W. E. Reynolds.....	6
Hon. Joseph Walsh.....	20
Hon. Guy E. Campbell.....	22
Senior Capt. D. P. Foley.....	29
Boatswain N. Sjoberg.....	32
Communications submitted by Capt. Commandant Reynolds.....	41

3

INCREASE OF PAY FOR THE COAST GUARD.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, October 14, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. John J. Esch, chairman, presiding.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Chairman, on September 11 I introduced in the House H. R. 9204 increasing the pay of the commissioned and enlisted men, 30 per cent for the commissioned officers and 50 per cent for the enlisted men. This was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Military Affairs. Before I introduced the bill I consulted with Mr. Tyler Page as to what was the best way to proceed. He said that in 1908 when other measures of this kind were introduced, they were referred to one committee and that committee considered them, and the other committees took them up informally. Therefore, this bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and was for increasing the pay of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health organizations. The Committee on Naval Affairs began a hearing on this bill last Wednesday and have been holding hearings ever since and will continue.

The Esch bill, so called, refers to the warrant officers of the Coast Guard and as the men are here and ready, I understand, to go on with the hearing, I suggest that we follow the course of the Committee on Naval Affairs and hear all to-day, both about raising the pay of the commissioned officers and enlisted men, and putting the Coast Guard under the jurisdiction of the Navy, and I would suggest that we proceed in that manner.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that this committee only has jurisdiction of the Coast Guard, it might be well for the Coast Guard to be heard first.

Mr. STINESS. Yes; I simply wish to state that instead of introducing four or five different bills, I followed custom and introduced this bill, and this part comes to this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hamilton and I are on the subcommittee having in charge the railroad bill and will have to be excused. Congressman Sweet, of Iowa, will have charge of the hearings.

Mr. SWEET. Gentlemen, we are now ready to take up hearings on Joint Resolution No. 189, and H. R. 9204, which relates to the increased pay of the Coast Guard.

We will now be glad to hear from Capt. Reynolds, of the Coast Guard.

**STATEMENT OF CAPT. COMMANDANT W. E. REYNOLDS,
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

Capt. REYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in regard to the House Joint Resolution 189, the purpose of this resolution is clearly indicated by its title. It is intended to equalize the pay and allowances of the personnel of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy, and with the permission of the chairman I will read a statement which completely covers the situation and suggests certain additions to that resolution as introduced, these additions, of course, being approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SWEET. You may proceed in your own way.

Capt. REYNOLDS. The Coast Guard is, by statute, part of the military forces of the United States, operating under the Treasury Department in time of peace, and operating as a part of the Navy, subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy, in time of war, or when the President shall so direct. Immediately upon the declaration of war, and under mobilization plans that had been prepared in advance, the entire Coast Guard was placed under the Navy Department, and served actively and energetically in precisely the same manner as the personnel of the Navy. Six of its vessels served with the naval forces in European waters; one of them, the *Tampa*, being sunk by an enemy submarine when all hands were lost. This disaster caused the largest loss of life suffered by any naval unit during the war, excepting only the case of the *Cyclops*, whose fate has never been ascertained. Officers of the Coast Guard commanded combatant ships of the Navy, served on cruisers and transports, in naval districts, in training stations, and, in short, performed exactly the same service as their brother officers in the Navy. Extremely favorable reports upon Coast Guard personnel have been made by ranking officers of the Navy. The Coast Guard performed its part in the great war not only with credit, but with marked distinction.

It was manifestly unjust that the personnel of the Coast Guard should undergo the same dangers, and suffer the same hardships as the Navy, and not receive the same pay. Congress recognized this injustice and took steps to remedy it, but, unfortunately, the remedy is limited to the continuance of the present war.

Section 15 of the act approved May 22, 1917, increased the pay of the enlisted men of the Navy, such increase to continue not later than six months after the termination of the war, and contains the following provision:

That during the continuance of the present war, warrant officers, petty officers, and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard shall receive the same rates of pay as are now, or may hereafter be, prescribed for corresponding grades or ratings and length of service in the Navy.

Mr. DEWALT. May I interrupt you a moment? For my own information, what is a petty officer?

Capt. REYNOLDS. He is an enlisted man who by length of service and competency has been given an additional rate above the lowest rate, and he becomes a leader of certain sections, depending upon the department in which he is serving; that is, a leader of those under him.

Mr. DEWALT. How does he take rank with a yeoman, we will say?

Capt. REYNOLDS. The yeoman is a petty officer.

Mr. DEWALT. What other officers are included in this term "petty officers"?

Capt. REYNOLDS. We have ship's writers, coxswains, quarter-masters, masters at arms, assistant masters at arms, and several others.

Mr. DEWALT. Those would be included within the provisions of this resolution?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

This legislation placed the warrant officers and enlisted men on a just footing as far as pay is concerned with the corresponding personnel of the Navy during the war.

There still existed this unfair discrimination: Officers of the Navy receive an increase of pay of 10 per cent while on sea duty, but officers of the Coast Guard serving at sea in the war zone and those serving on the same ships with officers of the Navy, and performing exactly the same duty, were not, under the law, entitled to this 10 per cent increase. This markedly unjust condition was remedied in the naval appropriation act of July 1, 1918, by the following provision:

That officers of the United States Coast Guard on sea duty or on shore duty beyond the continental limits of the United States during the period of the present war shall receive the same increases of pay and allowances in all respects, as are now, or may hereafter be, provided by law for officers of the Navy of corresponding rank.

I invite attention to the fact that, while the law provided that the increase of pay for enlisted men of the Navy should continue not later than six months after the termination of the present war, the pay of enlisted men of the Coast Guard is made the same as that of the Navy only during the continuance of the present war. Recognizing the fact that enlisted men in the Navy faced a reduction of pay when the war emergency shall cease, Congress provided, in the naval appropriation act approved July 11, 1919, that the rates of pay prescribed in section 15 of the act of May 22, 1917, "are made permanent for the enlisted men of the Navy during their present current enlistment, and for those who enlist or reenlist prior to July 1, 1920, for the term of such enlistment or reenlistment."

Unless this resolution be enacted into law, the rates of pay for warrant officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard must revert to their prewar basis when peace is declared. The Coast Guard rates of pay were fixed by the act of April 16, 1908. Though presumably fair at that time, they are to-day, because of the enormously increased cost of the necessities of living, wholly inadequate to the support of the men and their families. The merchant service is paying men in various ratings far more than the prewar Coast Guard rates of pay, and, without legislation of this character, it will be manifestly most difficult for the service to retain trained men or to obtain others in their places. There is no sea service in the country whose efficiency is more dependent upon a contented and well-trained enlisted personnel.

Mr. MERRITT. I beg your pardon, but I was not here when you began. Have you stated, or will you state later, what the difference in pay is now in the different grades?

Capt. REYNOLDS. That will come in later, and I shall refer to data which we have.

Mr. MERRITT. Very well.

Capt. REYNOLDS. Our vessels go to sea in all weathers, often in gales of wind, to render assistance to vessels in distress. It is obvious that we must have high-class men, and we simply can not get them unless we can offer them reasonable compensation.

I am sure the committee realizes the inherent justice that manifested itself in giving our personnel the same pay as the Navy during the war. All that we ask in this resolution is that this measure of justice be not abrogated when peace is declared, but that the pay of the personnel continue on the obviously just and reasonable basis of Navy pay. I am sure that no one will assert that the duties of the Coast Guard personnel in time of peace are less arduous than those of the Navy.

It will be noted that the resolution includes pay and allowances. I should like to explain briefly about this matter of allowances. The Navy has found that the efficient administration of a ship is greatly enhanced by granting certain small allowances to men in certain ratings, or performing certain special classes of duty. For example, the coxswain of a motor boat is allowed \$5 a month extra while on that detail. This gives him more money than the coxswain of a pulling boat receives, which is fair and reasonable. When a man from the deck force is detailed to duty in the fireroom, he receives 33 cents per day extra. Very often it is necessary on our ships, on account of a shortage in the fireroom force, to detail men from the deck to feed the furnaces for a day or so. These men receive no additional compensation. Most of them are probably aware that a man thus detailed in the Navy would obtain this extra 33 cents, and the knowledge that they themselves do not receive it, is not conducive to a spirit of contentment. A signalman, third-class, receives \$1 a month extra; a signalman, second-class, \$2 a month extra. These slight increases of pay incite the bridge force to perfect themselves in signaling. A man in the Navy who receives a good conduct medal gets 75 cents a month additional to his pay. This is a small sum, but the beneficial effect upon the ship's personnel is considerable.

Now, we have on board our ships precisely the same conditions; we have men who serve as coxswain of motor boats; men who have to perform additional duty in the fireroom; men who serve as gun pointers, and men whose conduct makes them worthy of good conduct medals, etc. It is necessary for the efficiency of our personnel, and only fair to them, that we should be able to grant these allowances, but we can not do so without the necessary legislation. If it be provided that our personnel shall receive the same pay and allowances as those of the Navy, the whole matter will be on a reasonable and just basis, and we shall not be confronted with the various problems incident to these inequalities of pay for what are exactly the same duties.

Particularly for warrant officers are the prewar rates of pay utterly inadequate to enable them to live properly and to support their families. Efficient warrant officers are a tremendous asset in the administration of the service. Their importance and value can not be overestimated. They are expected and required to be provided with proper uniforms and to present always a neat appearance that will be an example to the enlisted men. The warrant officers' corps of the Coast Guard is an honor to the service and to the Government. Its members are devoting their lives to the service, and their interests

should be properly protected. These warrant officers are now receiving the pay and allowances of warrant officers of the Navy. It will be most unfortunate and unfair if, upon the declaration of peace, they shall be compelled to revert to their inadequate prewar pay. I desire to emphasize to the committee the fact that this resolution simply grants to warrant officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard the same pay and allowances that Congress sees fit to give to warrant officers and enlisted men of the Navy performing precisely the same, or markedly similar work.

AMENDMENTS.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his letter of September 9, 1919, strongly recommended this resolution, and asked that two amendments be inserted, and I should like to explain them to the committee. These amendments are:

1. Line 3, after the word "That" insert the words "commissioned officers."

This resolution is primarily intended to give to warrant officers and enlisted men the pay and allowances to which they are justly entitled, and thereby enable us to keep our ships and stations in operation. Commissioned officers of the Coast Guard now receive the same pay and allowances as officers of corresponding rank in the Army. It would be an anomalous situation to have the pay of officers based on that of the Army and the pay of warrant officers and enlisted men based on that of the Navy. By including commissioned officers in this resolution, this anomaly will be removed. The officers will not benefit financially at all, except in one respect. They are now, under existing war legislation, as previously described, receiving 10 per cent increase of pay while on sea duty. Officers of the Navy receive this increase in time of peace and no good reason can be advanced why officers of the Coast Guard are not equally entitled to it in time of peace.

Mr. DEWALT. Before you leave that, may I interrupt you again. If you were to include the amendments suggested by the Secretary, to wit, commissioned officers and also include what is now mentioned in the proviso, to wit, allowances, the question in my mind is this: Army officers are now allowed a certain amount for quarters and if, as I said before, you include commissioned officers and also carry in this resolution allowances, would that give the stipend for quarters to commissioned officers in the Navy as is given to commissioned officers in the Army, or quarters.

Capt. REYNOLDS. You mean commissioned officers of the Coast Guard?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Capt. REYNOLDS. The law provides certain allowances for officers of the Navy and this resolution would give us similar allowances.

Mr. DEWALT. I am talking now specifically of quarters. For instance, a major in the Army, I think, gets four rooms, does he not?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Five rooms.

Mr. DEWALT. And that is calculated at so much per room?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWALT. Is that same thing applicable to the members of the Coast Guard?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWALT. They now receive that?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWALT. So these allowances would carry that stipend also?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that what you call commutation of quarters?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes; that is what we call commutation of quarters.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As distinguished from the actual quarters themselves?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is an allowance with which you provide yourself with quarters?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

2. Insert the following proviso before the word "Provided" in line 7:

Provided, That the senior district superintendent, the three district superintendents next in order of seniority, the four district superintendents next below these three in order of seniority, and the junior five district superintendents shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, and third lieutenant in the Coast Guard, respectively.

The act of January 28, 1915, designated district superintendents as commissioned officers in the Coast Guard, but did not prescribe their rank. It being essential for purposes of administration that the precedence of this corps of officers be determined so far as concerns the other commissioned officers of the Coast Guard, the omission in the law was remedied so far as was possible through administrative action by the regulations of the Coast Guard, 1916, in which these 13 district superintendents were distributed among the several grades in approximately the same proportion as officers of the line and engineer corps are distributed among their several grades. These district superintendents are commissioned officers under the law, but the law gives them no actual or relative rank, and they are not entitled to the pay and allowances of other commissioned officers. The naval appropriation act of July 1, 1918, contains the following language:

That during the period of the present war, the senior district superintendent, the three district superintendents next in order of seniority, the four district superintendents next below these three in order of seniority, and the junior five district superintendents shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, and third lieutenant in the Coast Guard, respectively.

So that the language that it is desired to incorporate in the joint resolution is now actually the law, but during the period of the present war only, and, in any event, not later than six months after peace shall be declared, at which time the district superintendents will resume their anomalous status without rank and without the pay and allowances granted other commissioned officers, unless this legislation be enacted.

With the approval of the Secretary, I urge that the committee will insert one additional amendment, namely, in line 7 after the word "Navy" insert the following:

; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fix and determine the several grades and ratings for warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men of the Coast Guard:

Mr. SWEET. That is to be inserted right after the word "Navy," in line 7, you say.

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

This provision is contained in the first section of the bill, H. R. 1209, introduced by Mr. Stiness and referred to this committee. It also appeared in the first section of the bill, H. R. 6979, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, which bill was favorably reported to the House by this committee but did not come to a vote. I shall endeavor to explain its purpose.

From 1790, when the Revenue-Cutter Service was first established, until 1915 the different ratings of warrant officers, and petty officers and other enlisted men were established, as a matter of administrative determination, by the Secretary of the Treasury, as the needs of the service required. In the act of January 28, 1915, creating the Coast Guard by combining the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Life-Saving Service, section 2 provides:

That in the Coast Guard there shall be * * * warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, all of said offices, respectively, corresponding to the present offices of the Revenue-Cutter Service, which are transferred to the Coast Guard. * * *

This section has been construed by the law officers as taking from the Secretary the authority to establish any grade or rating among the warrant and enlisted personnel that did not exist at the time of the passage of this act. Hence, now if it becomes clearly evident that new conditions make it necessary for the sake of efficient administration that new ratings be established, we have no authority to enable us to establish those ratings. This authority could be used in certain instances to effect economies. For example, on each cruising ship of the service it is now necessary to have a boatswain—a warrant officer. If the Secretary had the requisite authority, he could establish the rating of boatswain's mate, and boatswains' mates could be placed on the smaller vessels instead of boatswains, with a resulting decrease of expense, as boatwains' mates are petty officers and receive less pay than warrant officers. Again, if we could establish the ratings of quartermaster, second class, and quartermaster, third class, which ratings would carry less pay than the rating of full quartermaster, we could require a man, whom we would not promote directly to full quartermaster, to first pass through those subordinate grades, which would effect an economy. It is very desirable that we have authority to establish the warrant rating of pay clerk to look out for pay accounts, supplies, etc., on board ships and in districts; also to create the grades of hospital apprentice and pharmacists' mates of different classes, to take care of the sick and disabled on board ship. It is true that there is now the rating of bayman, whose duty it is to attend to the sick, but there are no ratings for men performing that kind of duty above or below the rating of bayman, so that there is no opportunity to advance a man through the various ratings that should be provided for this class of duty as he shows ability and acquires experience.

These are merely examples of the flexibility that is desired in this matter, and which the administrative head of the service possessed prior to the enactment of the act of January 28, 1915.

The resolution before you provides that warrant officers and petty officers and other enlisted men of the Coast Guard shall receive the same pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be prescribed

for corresponding grades or ratings and length of service in the Navy. This amendment to which I am referring will assist in the smooth administration of the provisions of the resolution by enabling the Secretary to establish grades and ratings to correspond appropriately with grades and ratings in the Navy when the duties are similar.

In concluding this statement, I beg to impress upon you that the personnel of the Coast Guard, having made a distinguished record in this greatest war of history, does not, now that the conflict is over, enjoy the comfort and freedom from danger and hardship associated in most walks of life, with the pleasant paths of peace. Now free from the menace of enemy submarines, one of which sent to their deaths 112 gallant officers and men of the *Tampa*, it continues to face the perils and hardships incident to cruising in small ships in wintry gales, often in dangerous proximity to shoals and reefs, in the duty performed with zeal and enthusiasm of assisting humanity at sea.

In this connection, a brief résumé of the operations of some of the Coast Guard vessels during the past eight days may interest you.

The *Ossipee* searched for the American steamer *Lake Gravatt*, at sea in a gale and short of coal. When the *Ossipee* received this call, she was at the Portsmouth Navy Yard having her armament changed. A pay-day liberty watch was ashore, one boiler was being cleaned, coal and provisions had to be taken on board, and navy yard workmen had already begun work on the vessel. To one unfamiliar with the traditions of the Coast Guard, these conditions might seem to have justified a report from the *Ossipee* that she was unable to proceed on this duty. The *Ossipee* made no such report; but, on the contrary, after strenuous efforts on the part of everyone on board and assisted in the fireroom by volunteers from the deck force, the vessel sailed promptly, with 11 men short in the engine-room force, and with only 4 men in a watch on deck. The *Lake Gravatt* got in under her own steam and the *Ossipee* was diverted to the assistance of the American steamer *Yaklok*, which she rescued and towed into harbor at Boston.

The *Acushnet* searched for the *Lake Gravatt* and the *Yaklok*, and was then sent to the assistance of a vessel reported in distress at sea, and for which she is still searching.

The *Seneca* floated the American steamer *Passaic Bridge*, ashore at Barnegat, and is now searching for the steamer *Ammunossuc*, disabled and leaking and drifting at sea.

The *Gresham* towed into Hampton Roads the American steamer *Hatchie*, found disabled at sea. She was cruising in search of the disabled steamer *Aimwell* and the derelict *Hugh Depaynes* when diverted to assist the *Hatchie*.

The *Seminole* cruised in search of the derelict *Hugh Depaynes* and was diverted to assist the *Aimwell*. When it was learned that the *Aimwell* had been picked up, the *Seminole* resumed search for the derelict and is still cruising.

The *Tallapoosa* cruised in search of two derelicts in the Gulf of Mexico. She located one and is searching for the other.

The *Tuscarora* assisted to float several vessels stranded in the vicinity of Key West during the recent hurricane.

The *Yamacraw* cruised in search of derelict schooner *Hugh Depaynes* and the overdue steamer *Larimer*.

The *Unalga* is standing by a disabled American vessel at Unalaska, Alaska, preserving order among her large crew of cannery hands.

The *Itasca* was sent to assist the steamer *Crawley* ashore on the Jersey coast. This steamer floated before the *Itasca* could reach her.

The *Bear* has been assigned to rescue, if possible, the crew of the *Belvedere*, crushed in the ice near Cape Serdz, Siberia. This means that the *Bear*, having completed her summer's cruise in the Arctic Ocean, and on her way home after five months' arduous work in northern waters, must now turn north again and endeavor to reach the Siberian coast in the face of the oncoming Arctic winter.

All of these operations have taken place in the past eight days. They are all part of the day's work for the Coast Guard, and will suggest to you the character of work the service now performs and will perform on an even larger scale during the coming winter. These ships are performing this arduous duty with inadequate crews in almost every instance.

We ask that Congress continue to grant these officers and men the pay and allowances of corresponding grades and ratings in the Navy which have been given them for the continuance of the present war only.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this resolution, with the amendments offered, is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, and I am authorized to speak for him in this matter. I earnestly hope that the committee will favor the resolution as amended and assist its passage through Congress. We are urgently in need of this measure. This is not a fanciful plea, but it is something with which we are in contact every day, and the needs are growing more grave day by day. As the periods of enlistment of the men expire they will not reenlist, nor can we enlist experienced men to take the places of those who leave. They can get much more pay elsewhere. Our men see no hope unless you gentlemen will give them the benefits proposed in this resolution. This will tide them over until another measure may be gotten through. I refer now to a general increase in pay which has been proposed, but regarding which I am not advised of the Secretary's views, and of which I can not speak for him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that general increase proposed with respect to the Coast Guard or the Navy?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I refer to the bill to increase pay to which reference was made a short time ago.

Mr. STINESS. He is referring to H. R. 9204.

Mr. DEWALT. What, to your mind, if you have any opinion upon the subject, was the reason for the discrimination in pay as between the Coast Guard officers and naval officers?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I am really unable to answer that. We never thought there was any justice in it. Probably no discrimination was intended; I presume it was simply overlooked by Congress.

Mr. DEWALT. There must have been something in the minds of the authorities. Have you any theory at all with reference to it? It seems to me that their duties are just as arduous, and, in fact, from my knowledge of the subject, they seem to be more arduous.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I think we are entitled to equal consideration at all events.

Mr. DEWALT. You do not know the reason for this discrimination?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would not the Coast Guard officer have a more fixed home than the naval officer?

Capt. REYNOLDS. No, sir; they are liable to change and to change frequently from one section of the country to another.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As much so as a naval officer?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I think so. Our policy is to change the officers fairly frequently. We have them serve on different sections of the coast so as to become familiar with all parts of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Ordinarily the naval officers, and especially the young naval officers, have no home life at all. Their families have to be jumping about from place to place to meet the husband and father.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I may say that they are better off in that respect than our young officers. Normally we do not have so large a number of shore stations to which to assign our officers as the Navy has, and most of our officers serve more time, very much more time, on board ship than on shore.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But when they do come ashore they know where they will find their families better than the naval officers do?

Capt. REYNOLDS. They may know where to find them, but they have the same difficulty in being with them as officers of the Navy have.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The naval officer after the expiration of three years' sea service gets shore leave.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not know exactly what the policy of the Navy is, but I think they rotate in shore duty and sea duty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you have shore duty?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Not regularly. We have shore stations, but in normal times they have not been sufficient in number to give regular rotation between shore duty and ship duty. That is to say, after an officers serves three years on board ship, he can not by any means count upon one, two, or three years' service on shore. The chances are that he will get another sea assignment. That is especially true in the case of the young officer, and it may be 8 or 10 years before he has an opportunity to be on shore duty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does not the Navy have the advantage of you in that respect?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I think so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In the Navy every three or five years they give a man so much shore leave, whether he has shore duty or not.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not understand what is meant by shore leave.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I mean service on shore instead of at sea.

Capt. REYNOLDS. Do you mean shore duty?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Capt. REYNOLDS. They get it more frequently than we, although I do not know the present policy of the Navy Department in that particular. I am satisfied that they get more opportunities for shore duty than our officers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you have the grade of senior lieutenant in your service, or lieutenant, senior grade?

Capt. REYNOLDS. No, sir; that corresponds with our first lieutenant.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does your first lieutenant correspond practically to the grade of captain in the Navy?

Capt. REYNOLDS. To captain in the Army or to lieutenant in the Navy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But he does not get the same pay as the lieutenants of senior grade in the Navy?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Our pay is based on Army pay, which is practically the same as Navy pay, and the allowances are the same, except that after the war our officers will lose the 10 per cent additional for sea duty which was granted them during the continuance of the war.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Your Coast Guard officer with that rank, then, does get the same pay as the corresponding rank in the Navy?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; except as to the additional pay for sea duty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the Coast Guard were transferred to the Navy Department, then by operation of law the objects of this bill would be at once accomplished, would they not?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I presume they would be.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Of course, I am not speaking of the merits of it.

Mr. SWEET. In a letter written to Congressman Hamilton of Michigan the writer raises this question:

The point which I wish to bring to an issue is just whom are included by the wording "commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men." To the writer there are three possibilities. First, this resolution affects all the personnel of the Coast Guard, either active or retired; second, it affects only those on active duty; and third, it affects only those who have served or may be serving at present at the higher rate of pay, that of the Navy.

My father's case comes under this third possibility. He served with the Coast Guard under the Navy until his retirement, August 1, 1919, on account of having reached the age of 64 years. He drew the higher rate of pay, \$2,000 per year, that of the Navy, for 26 months preceding his retirement, yet his retired pay is not three-fourths of his highest active duty pay, as prescribed by the Coast Guard law.

This man is now receiving three-fourths of \$1,400, the old Coast Guard pay, or \$1,050 per annum, instead of \$1,500 per annum. Does this resolution as drawn remedy that situation?

Capt. REYNOLDS. No, sir.

Mr. SWEET. Do you suggest any amendment along that line with reference to retired officers or men?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not in this resolution.

Mr. SWEET. And this resolution does not apply to retired men?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Not to a case of that kind, as I understand it.

Mr. STINESS. Captain, you are familiar with the bill H. R. 9204, that being a bill to advance the pay of officers 30 per cent and of enlisted men 50 per cent, are you not?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I have looked over that bill, but I have not given it complete study.

Mr. STINESS. Have you attended any of the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs on that bill?

Capt. REYNOLDS. No, sir. I was in the committee room a few days ago, but it was simply to see some one there, and I did not hear any of the proceedings.

Mr. STINESS. The primary object of this resolution 189 is to put the Coast Guard on an equality with the Navy, is it not?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; in regard to pay and allowances.

Mr. STINESS. Now, there has been a good deal of testimony before the Committee on Naval Affairs by Admiral Sims, Admiral Wilson, and others that the pay of the enlisted men and commissioned officers of the Navy is not sufficient for them to live on. Are you familiar with the pay of the Navy?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; reasonably so.

Mr. STINESS. Could your men and officers live on the same pay that naval officers and men receive?

Capt. REYNOLDS. In regard to this particular bill, I am not advised as to the Secretary's views, and I can not speak for him upon it.

Mr. STINESS. I am not asking now for the Secretary's opinion upon it, but I want your individual opinion. We are asked to legislate upon this subject, and we want your individual opinion upon it. From your knowledge of the duties of the men in the Coast Guard—and I am referring to both officers and enlisted men—in your opinion is it possible for them to live respectably on the wages that are paid men and officers in the Navy, if they are paid the same wages?

Capt. REYNOLDS. At the present time?

Mr. STINESS. Yes; of course.

Capt. REYNOLDS. We need an increase of pay all along the line to enable the men, and officers also, to get along as they should. This particular resolution will tide them over until other legislation can be enacted. This particular resolution is to cover that feature. Our men will suffer a reduction in pay and allowances immediately peace is declared, but the Navy will not; in fact, some allowances have been cut off already, and the loss is working a great hardship. But the resolution does not provide a complete remedy and must be supplemented by other legislation along the lines proposed in the bill introduced by you.

Mr. STINESS. The question I asked you was this: If they should receive the same pay that the men and officers in the Navy are now receiving, could they live on that?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; they could live on it; that is, some could, but not comfortably. We will require, or we should have, additional pay, similar to that provided in the bill you have mentioned.

Mr. STINESS. Then, when you say this would tide them over the period until other legislation can be passed, you do not consider that if you were put in the same position that the Navy is in at the present time they could live on that?

Capt. REYNOLDS. We could for the present, until we can get some other legislation, but not comfortably, nor as we are expected to live. We hoped we might get this relief immediately, so as to tide us over until something else could be done. Some of our men are now suffering a reduction amounting to \$1.25 per day, and that has been the case since the latter part of August; some of these men are not able to live on their income. Referring to the matter of allowances in the Navy, the enlisted men, when on detached duty, or duty away from a station or ship where a general mess is conducted, are allowed a fair sum per day for subsistence. This is now denied the Coast Guard enlisted men under similar conditions. Those on ships are subsisted well, the ration costing about 80 cents per day per man. This ration is cooked and served without expense of any kind to the men. With those on detached duty, however, the law provides that each man, in lieu of a ration in kind, shall be allowed 45 cents per day.

With that 45 cents the man is expected to purchase not only the necessary food for a day, but to have the food prepared for cooking, cooked, and served.

Mr. STINESS. Now, you stated in answer to a question by Gov. Montague that your men were changed around as much as they were in the Navy. Are the men in the Coast Guard service in the stations along the coast changed, or are they sent, say, from Rhode Island and Massachusetts to Georgia?

Capt. REYNOLDS. The enlisted men are generally not taken from the stations, although the law permits it. That is, if we are short of men at one station and we can spare men at another station, the law permits us to change them. However, it has not been the policy to do so.

Mr. STINESS. Your answer to Gov. Montague, then, was only in regard to men on the vessels?

Capt. REYNOLDS. That was in regard to men who serve afloat. You will understand that all commissioned officers are subject to frequent change of station.

Mr. STINESS. As a matter of fact, do you not find it difficult at the present time to get enlistments or reenlistments in the Coast Guard?

Capt. REYNOLDS. It is very difficult.

Mr. STINESS. Is it not the claim of men who have been in the Coast Guard and whom you have tried to get back into the Coast Guard that they can not live on the pay?

Capt. REYNOLDS. That is the claim of the men, and it is a just claim.

Mr. STINESS. As a matter of fact, is not the Coast Guard pretty well demoralized to-day on account of not being able to get good men?

Capt. REYNOLDS. We are reaching the point now where we soon will be unable to operate efficiently many of our units.

Mr. STINESS. You have reached that point in some cases?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. STINESS. You are short of men.

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; all along the line.

Mr. STINESS. And something must be done to get efficiency in your organization?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Absolutely. I might just mention a case that occurred two weeks ago: We wanted to get a ship out quickly to aid a vessel in distress, but she did not have enough men in her engine-room force to go out for an extended cruise, and she could not go until she could get a few more men.

Mr. WEBSTER. Following the question asked by Gen. Stiness, the provisions of your resolution are:

That warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard Service shall receive the same pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be prescribed for corresponding grades or ratings and length of service in the Navy.

Therefore, if the compensation of the Navy should be increased it would result in an automatic increase for your men, under the terms of this resolution?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STINESS. That is a contingency that you are hoping for?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; absolutely. It is necessary.

Mr. STINESS. That is what you would expect?

Capt. REYNOLDS. We hope so. That bill applies to the Coast Guard, but under this resolution, if the Coast Guard were eliminated there, it would apply just the same.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Hamilton spoke to me a few moments ago in reference to retirement from the Coast Guard. I think you went over that with the Captain.

Mr. SWEET. I did briefly.

Mr. COOPER. Captain, I would like to ask you a question. The question that Gen. Stiness asked you was not quite clear to me, nor was your answer. If I understood Gen. Stiness's question aright, he asked if your men would be satisfied with the same pay or the same rate of pay that the Navy is now getting. That is what this bill provides for, is it not? You favor this resolution, do you not?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do.

Mr. COOPER. In other words, you would like to have the same condition prevail in the Coast Guard relative to pay that now exists in the Navy, is that it?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir. Pay and allowances. Entertaining the hope that further legislation will increase the compensation of all.

Mr. WEBSTER. So that as the Navy pay improved that of the Coast Guard would also?

Capt. REYNOLDS. That would follow as a matter of course. That is provided for in this resolution.

Mr. STINESS. I understood the captain to say that this was only a temporary makeshift to tide over the time until the Navy could get an increase, but he has not in answer to your question or in answer to mine made a definite statement as to whether he thought the Coast Guard people could live on the pay that the officers and men of the Navy are now getting. He said he had not been advised in regard to the action of the Secretary on that bill, and I asked him for his individual opinion.

Mr. COOPER. That is the question that I was not at all clear about.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I did not intend to evade any question.

Mr. DEWALT. In order to get clearly into the record Mr. Hamilton's suggestion I will state this concrete case to you, captain, by quoting from the letter:

The point which I wish to bring to an issue is just who are included by the wording "commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men"? To the writer there are three possibilities: First, this resolution affects all the personnel of the Coast Guard, either active or retired; second, it affects only those on active duty, and third, it affects only those who have served or may be serving at present at the higher rate of pay, that of the Navy.

My father's case comes under this third possibility. He served with the Coast Guard under the Navy until his retirement August 1, 1919, on account of having reached the age of 64 years. He drew the higher rate of pay, \$2,000 per year, that of the Navy, for 26 months preceding his retirement, yet his retired pay is not three-fourths of his highest active duty pay, as prescribed by the Coast Guard Law. He is receiving at present three-fourths of \$1,400, the old Coast Guard pay, or \$1,050 per annum instead of \$1,500 per annum.

He says there are other cases similar to this, and referring to them he says:

Some of these men, I understand, received the higher retired pay of the Navy for a time, and then had their rate reduced to that of the old pay, and were ordered to reimburse the Government for an amount equal to the difference in retired pay of the two rates which they had received.

This resolution would not affect or remedy that case or claim for justice, would it?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not think so, but that would be a question which I think the legal officers would have to pass upon.

Mr. DEWALT. It seems to me that if the premises as given by the writer of this letter are correct, then this joint resolution would not contemplate retired pay based upon the higher naval pay now obtaining. Is not that so?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not think it will; but, as I said before, that is a legal question I should not like to answer.

Mr. SWEET. If there are no other questions, we thank you for your statement.

Capt. REYNOLDS. If I can answer the question Mr. Stiness asked, I should be pleased to do so. If you would like me to answer that question I will do so now that I fully comprehend it.

Mr. STINESS. I do not care whether you answer it or not. You are your own judge as to what you want to testify to. If you think that the Coast Guard does not need any raise in pay over what the Navy is now getting, that is all there is to it.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I certainly think they should get more pay, but this is to tide them over until the other measure can go through.

Mr. STINESS. Do you think it ought to go through?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; I am heartily in favor of it or of similar legislation.

Mr. STINESS. Are you in favor of the bill H. R. 9204 to increase the pay of the officers in the Navy 30 per cent and the pay of the enlisted men in the Navy 50 per cent?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I am in favor of it.

Mr. STINESS. That is what I have been trying to get at.

Capt. REYNOLDS. This resolution provides that any future legislation for the benefit of the Navy will automatically apply to the Coast Guard.

Mr. STINESS. We wanted to know whether you favored an increase in the Navy pay over what they are now getting.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I favor an increase in the Coast Guard pay in accordance with the terms of that bill.

Mr. STINESS. Are you in favor of increasing the Navy pay?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I think it should be increased, although I am not in a position to speak for the Navy.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Merritt asked one of the officers, I think Capt. Reynolds, about some statistics, and at that time he referred to one of the other officers here. If they have those statistics as to the pay now and before the war, I think it would be well to have that put in as a part of the record.

Mr. MERRITT. What I asked Capt. Reynolds was if we did not pass this bill what the difference would be between the Navy pay and the Coast Guard pay?

Mr. STINESS. I understood Capt. Reynolds to say that some other officer here would give that information, and I think we ought to have those statistics.

Mr. WEBSTER. There will be no objection to making that compilation of the officer's a part of the hearing, will there, Captain?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I think not, sir.

Mr. SWEET. That may be made a part of the hearing.

(The papers referred to follow:)

Comparative rates of pay—Coast Guard war pay, prewar pay, and Shipping Board pay.

Rating.	Shipping Board equivalent.	Present war pay.	Prewar pay, effective if joint resolution not enacted.	Shipping Board rate of pay.
Master-at-arms.....	Chief steward.....	\$66.00	\$60.00	\$115.00-\$160.00
Electrician, first class.....	Chief radio operator.....	74.00	68.00	125.00
Ship's writer.....		60.00	54.00	
Machinist, first class.....		68.50	60.00	
Oiler, first class.....	Oiler.....	56.40	50.40	95.00
Quartermaster.....	Quartermaster.....	48.80	40.80	87.50
Coxswain.....		46.40	38.40	
Water tender.....	Water tender.....	55.50	44.40	95.00
Electrician, third class.....	Assistant radio operator.....	48.00	40.00	100.00
Seaman.....	Able seaman.....	44.00	36.00	85.00
Surfman.....		71.00	65.00	
Fireman.....	Fireman.....	46.50	38.40	90.00
Ordinary seaman.....	Ordinary seaman.....	36.80	28.80	65.00
Coal heaver.....	Coal passer.....	41.60	33.60	75.00
Cabin steward.....	Chief cook.....	61.00	48.00	135.00
Cook.....	Second cook.....	52.40	44.40	100.00
Steerage cook.....	Third cook.....	41.00	30.00	90.00
Boy, first class.....	Messman.....	41.00	21.60	70.00

Allowance for quarters and food for men on shore or detached duty.

Coast Guard.	Navy.	Shipping Board.
\$10 per month for quarters; \$0.45 per day for food.	\$2 per day for quarters and food..	\$2 per day for meals and room.

Rates shown for prewar pay are east coast rates; west coast rates are somewhat higher.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH WALSH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to have just a moment or two, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I want to bring to the committee's attention the need for some increase in the compensation of the Coast Guard men, particularly those who are in the shore service and stationed at the life-saving stations.

I think the captain-commandant has stated the situation fully, but I direct the committee's attention to the fact that we are now approaching the season of the year when there is great need for a full complement of men at the various Coast Guard stations along the shore. The district which I have the honor to represent has a large number of these stations, and I think there are at the present time some sixty or seventy-five vacancies. It is a very dangerous coast in the winter season, that along Cape Cod.

Personally, I think during peace times the actual service performed by the Coast Guard is more valuable than that of the Navy, and I do not mean to reflect upon the Navy in making that statement. Psychologically, perhaps, the Navy renders a greater service during peace times, but actually the Coast Guard acts, you might say, as the policemen of the coast, rendering most valuable service, and we have a service which can quickly respond to wrecks and steamers in dis-

tress and answers these cries for assistance and appeals for aid. We have the life-savers along the coast who can quickly get into action and render assistance.

The merchant marine is taking a great many of these men who are competent to fill positions upon ships at sea. They are paying a much greater wage than the coast guard law permits.

While, as you gentlemen know, I am not a wild enthusiast upon increasing appropriations for the purpose of raising salaries and pay in the Federal service at this particular time, I do submit that where a service is suffering, where men are leaving it by reason of the greater opportunities they find in other branches of Government service, that it is a just appeal to make to ask to have an increase granted to this very important service.

Mr. COOPER. May I interrupt you there, Congressman?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Why is it that the Government can not pay the same wage to our Government employees that private industry pays?

Mr. WALSH. Well, I think the answer is that Congress will not let them.

Mr. COOPER. How do you expect to get good, competent men in the Government service if the opportunities outside are so much better?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the Government service is supposed to offer certain benefits and advantages—I do not know whether they always do—that private service does not offer.

Mr. COOPER. But these men can not live on their uniforms.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, in this service there is no similar service performed in private industry; but, for instance, take the merchant marine. I think the seamen in the merchant marine get something like \$80 or \$90 a month, as I recall it. That is a service which requires just the kind of men you find along the coast at these life-saving stations; that you find aboard the Coast Guard cutters, and it pays so much more that these men, of course, are attracted to it and will give up these berths.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Walsh, what is the wage in the Coast Guard service of the enlisted men?

Mr. WALSH. I think it is \$65 or \$70 a month, and they also have a ration allowance.

Mr. MERRITT. The men in the merchant service get their rations also, do they not?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. STINESS. Is it not a fact that it is more attractive to the seamen to go into the merchant service because they can leave at any time they see fit?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. STINESS. And when they enter the Government service it is for a fixed term of one or more years?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; that is true; but I want to stress the importance of doing something to preserve this service. The Coast Guard, or the Life-Saving Service, I think, as a matter of history, antedates that of the Navy. It is one of the oldest Government services that we have, and, having lived on the seacoast all my life, I know what the Coast Guard, the former Revenue-Cutter Service, has done, the great service it has rendered to the shipping of the country, and I personally would

be willing to see the wages of the Coast Guard made equal, or a little more, perhaps, than what they get in the Navy during peace times. I think the service they rendered in this war has demonstrated that they are sending out most competent navigators and most competent men, and the men they put into training and take aboard their ships are men who can render service in the particular grades or lines in which they go equal to that of the graduate of Annapolis. They can not in the training school at New London go as high in their courses, but in the actual service performed they are as competent according to my observation.

Mr. COOPER. Is not this service very dangerous and hazardous, especially in times of storm when there is great distress upon the seas?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. And they practically take their lives in their hands?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; absolutely, not only aboard the cutters but at these life-saving stations.

Mr. COOPER. Are they small boats which do not ride the seas like the large boats would?

Mr. WALSH. The cutters are fairly good sized ships but they are not as large as the large cruisers of the Navy.

Mr. COOPER. They would be buffeted around more in time of storm.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, indeed. They have to put out in fogs and storms in an endeavor to find ships that are in distress. The men on the shore go out in their lifeboats to a vessel on the shoals or the rocks, and it is a particularly hazardous occupation, especially at this time of the year when the ships are getting into trouble along the coast during the winter season almost daily; and, as I said before, I should like to see the compensation and the salaries of these men increased so that the service may not be disrupted and rendered inefficient, and I trust the committee will give careful consideration to the argument.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Walsh, you said there were a large number of vacancies in your district.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. STINESS. What positions are they?

Mr. WALSH. They are mostly men at the life-saving stations, surfmen and the other positions that these men occupy at the life-saving stations.

I thank you, gentlemen, for this opportunity.

Mr. SWEET. Congressman Campbell, of Pennsylvania, I understand, desires to make a short statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. GUY E. CAMPBELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the welfare of the Coast Guard, and I have for some time been investigating conditions and think I am somewhat conversant with that service.

They are underpaid, and I introduced a bill that would place the Coast Guard permanently under the Navy, and the bill provides that they receive the same compensation as those in the Navy. It will give them a much larger field, and I can say that at least 90 per cent of the officers of the Coast Guard are favorable to the perma-

nent transfer of the Coast Guard to the Navy. They are short of men and they are having trouble getting men, and they will continue to have trouble in getting men because there is no field for them. Their scope is limited, and therefore I offer to the committee for consideration H. R. 5516 as a substitute, and will be glad to have the committee consider that.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Campbell, that bill was introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress and hearings were held on it, were there not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir; and I reintroduced it in the Sixty-sixth Congress, and there is every provision made for the Coast Guard, both the enlisted men and the officers.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Campbell, how do the Coast Guard people feel about this transfer to the Navy?

Mr. CAMPBELL. As I say, 90 per cent of the officers favor the transfer.

Mr. MERRITT. How do you get at the percentages? Has there been a referendum?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir; and I have it on file with every officer's name and his opinion in the matter.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Campbell, we had quite an extensive hearing on that bill in the last Congress, and the testimony is a matter of record, somewhere.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I have copies of the hearings at my office; and I might say that the Navy gives great credit to the Coast Guard officers for the efficient service performed in this war, and it is unfortunate for the men in the Coast Guard that they do not have a larger field of operations. They are splendid men. To illustrate, a man who is in the service for 38 years, the Treasury Department claim they need to protect the revenues or the customs, yet in his entire experience he had never been called upon in a single instance to protect the customs.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Campbell, will you give me the number of your bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL. 5516.

Mr. DEWALT. What did we do with that bill—did we report it out favorably?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; you were asked not to make any report because we would not have time to get it through.

Mr. STINESS. They were under the Navy at that time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; but since then by Executive order they have been returned to the Treasury Department and we contemplated having another hearing, but Mr. Daniels wants to appear before the committee and tell them why he thinks it is for the purpose of economy. Just to-day there are contracts out for boats for the Coast Guard costing this Government over \$3,000,000. The Navy has ships, and a number of ships, that will answer the purpose, and that contract could easily be canceled and boats that are now of no use to the Navy could be used for this Coast Guard work.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to ask you this question, simply for information: If the Coast Guard were to become part of the Navy would they still continue to do the same work they have been doing, or would the Secretary of the Navy have the power to put them into other lines of work?

Mr. CAMPBELL. If they are amalgamated with the Navy, the Navy takes over the work performed by the Coast Guard as a separate unit.

Mr. COOPER. I know that, but would these men be kept at their work?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Or would the Secretary of the Navy transfer them to other activities outside and separate from the Coast Guard work?

Mr. CAMPBELL. They would perform the duties performed by any other men in the Navy and the Coast Guard officer could handle a naval vessel the same as he handles a Coast Guard vessel, and they would be intermingled in that way.

Mr. COOPER. Is not special training along the line of Coast Guard work required?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is just the same as they get at Annapolis. They have their school at New London from which the Coast Guard cadets are graduated. It is a duplication of work, and on a conservative estimate this would save right to-day, if they were amalgamated, this one contract for these two ships, or \$3,000,000, and it would save upward of a million or a million and a half dollars every year. Capt. Laning and Admiral McKean were before the committee and testified to the effect that it would be far more economically operated under the Navy and that it rightfully belongs to the Navy, and the men want it there, with few exceptions.

Mr. DEWALT. There was some slim suspicion at that time that the passing of your measure would create places in the Navy for young men who were in the Coast Guard and give them advancement of rank. I suppose you heard that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWALT. What have you to say about that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That was incorrect. It gives the Coast Guard officers the same opportunity that the naval officers have, and takes care of them in their present ranks and provides for advanced rank for the captain commandant of the Coast Guard.

Mr. DEWALT. In line of that criticism, if I remember the testimony, and if I am wrong you will correct me, I think it was stated that the course of preparation at New London was materially different from the course of preparation at Annapolis, not only as to length of time but as to the course of study. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; I think not. I am informed by the graduates of New London that it is identically the same there as it is at Annapolis.

Mr. STINES. Are you not mistaken about that?

Mr. DEWALT. It may be I am.

Mr. STINESS. No; I am asking Mr. Campbell if he is not mistaken?

Mr. DEWALT. I think he is mistaken.

Mr. STINESS. Is it not a fact that the course is much harder at New London and that the entrance age is much higher at New London than it is at Annapolis? Perhaps, the captain commandant could give us more reliable information on that.

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; it might be well to elucidate that fact, if you will give way to the captain-commandant.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly.

Mr. DEWALT. Captain, what is the fact with reference to that, simply to refresh our recollections. The concrete question is this: At the time Mr. Campbell introduced his bill and when we had the hearings here, as we have stated, there was some criticism by reason of the alleged fact—you will notice I say alleged—that it was for the purpose of creating vacancies and advancements for junior officers in the Coast Guard; and, secondly, that the course of preparation for membership in the Coast Guard in your so-called academy was different from that which obtained at Annapolis. Now, what are the facts with reference to those two questions, if you have any knowledge on the subject?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Our age limit is different from that for admission to Annapolis, from 18 to 24. The course of study is somewhat similar. On general subjects it is similar, but our men have practically completed their academic course before they enter. I believe our entrance examinations are somewhat more difficult and rather a stage in advance of the requirements for entrance at the Naval Academy.

Mr. DEWALT. What is the length of the term at New London?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Three years.

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; that is my recollection, and it was four years at Annapolis until they cut it down to three years by reason of the war emergency?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, what have you to say with reference to this allegation as to the creation of advanced rank for the membership of the Coast Guard if they were transferred to the naval service? Does it make any material difference?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not believe it would make much difference. It is a question of selection when you get up to a certain grade in the Navy, which does not obtain in the Coast Guard. Whether the Coast Guard officers would be selected or not, I do not know. They have higher ranks in the Navy than we have, undoubtedly.

Mr. DEWALT. Well, here is a concrete example to my mind. I do not know whether it fits the occasion or not. Take your lieutenant in the Coast Guard, or your second lieutenants—you have second lieutenants, have you?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWALT. Take your second lieutenant in the Coast Guard. With whom does he rank in the naval service?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Junior lieutenant.

Mr. DEWALT. Is the relative pay the same?

Capt. REYNOLDS. It is the same.

Mr. DEWALT. Suppose there was a transfer of the Coast Guard personnel to the naval personnel; would there be any change in rank and pay by that mere fact of transfer?

Capt. REYNOLDS. None whatever in that grade.

Mr. DEWALT. What grades would it affect?

Capt. REYNOLDS. In years to come they have higher ranks in the Navy than we do in the Coast Guard, it being a much larger service.

Mr. DEWALT. What is the highest grade in the Coast Guard?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Captain commandant; and that, I may say, is a selective or presidential office. The highest rank outside of that is senior captain.

Mr. DEWALT. Therefore, in the Coast Guard, unless by presidential appointment, one would never rise to more than senior captain?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Not at the present time and under the present laws.

Mr. DEWALT. But if the Coast Guard were transferred to the Navy, then there would be this gradual rise in rank, either by the selective method or by seniority?

Capt. REYNOLDS. By the selective method in the Navy. We have it by seniority in our service.

Mr. DEWALT. Therefore, it would affect the officers of the Coast Guard after they arrived at the rank of senior captain, provided they were not retired by reaching the age limit?

Capt. REYNOLDS. It would begin to affect them in the matter of selection when they arrived at the rank of captain, which corresponds with lieutenant commander in the Navy, and from that time on it is a question of promotion by selection and not by seniority.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I might say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to Mr. Dewalt, that he referred to the alleged increase in rank. The men most anxious about the transfer of the Coast Guard to the Navy are men who will not benefit in any manner whatever. They are the oldest men, senior captains, who will soon be retired, and they have all been through this service and it can not help them. The charge was suggested that it would help these junior officers. It does not give them any more than what they are entitled to as a reward for the splendid service they rendered during the war. They were sent to command these warships and naval vessels, and they handled them splendidly and showed they were seamen, and my solicitude or my idea in the matter is that this would provide a larger field for them.

These men are capable of performing a larger service to this country than they can possibly perform in the Coast Guard, although that is an important service. The Navy has the ships. The Coast Guard does not have ships capable of going out in high seas and stormy weather, but the Navy has them. The Coast Guard belongs under the Navy in war times. They do not cooperate to the extent that their material fits in with the Navy. There was not a ship that the Coast Guard turned over to the Navy that did not have to go and be changed so that it could perform the duties of the Navy. They had different sizes of guns on them.

Mr. STINESS. Was it not also true that the Navy had to be all fixed over before they could go out properly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Many of them, certainly. As I say, they are not given the consideration they are entitled to. The Congress does not give them money to keep their ships in shape. It is no reflection on them. I do not mean to reflect on anybody in the Coast Guard, because they demonstrated with the poor material what they could do, but as I say, this gives them a larger field and they can perform a better service to the country, and it can be more economically performed, and these men all would be better satisfied. Take the enlisted man. He would have a wider field. There is no possibility now in the Coast Guard of his getting a commission, while there is in the Navy.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to ask Mr. Campbell one more question: There is no doubt in my mind but what the Coast Guard men receive a special training.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; that is true.

Mr. COOPER. And the training they receive must be a little different from the training in the Navy. If it is the same, why should they have two schools?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because the Coast Guard Service was established before the Navy. It came in under the Revenue Cutter Service.

Mr. COOPER. If the Navy should take over the Coast Guard Service, what effect would that have upon the splendid organization that has been built up for years in the Coast Guard personnel? What is to stop some Navy officer from coming in there and taking a place in the Coast Guard Service, and setting some Coast Guard men aside? What is to prevent them from putting some efficient Coast Guard man aside and putting in his place some man who probably is not so well equipped or educated along the lines of that work as the man who has been doing it for years?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is hardly possible. There are vacancies in the Navy and the Navy needs officers. Here are officers and men in the Coast Guard Service who are capable of performing duty in the Navy, and the Navy would welcome them. The Navy needs them and the country needs them in the Navy. They would be well taken care of in the Navy. There would be every advantage to the men in the Coast Guard Service to be transferred to the Navy, and there is every advantage to the Navy to take them over.

Mr. COOPER. We want your opinion as to what you think the effect would be on the organization of the Coast Guard. Do you think it would be just as efficient and just as well equipped as it has been in the past?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; and better equipped, because the Navy has larger supplies with which to take care of them, and it has larger vessels. There is a duplication of storehouses all along the coast, the Navy having its bases and the Coast Guard having its bases. They could be consolidated. As to the officers of the Coast Guard, as I said, nearly 90 per cent of them favor the transfer. If they did not think they would be treated fairly in the Navy or that their opportunities would not be greater in the Navy, they would not be in favor of the transfer. I attended a meeting in New York at which a number of Coast Guard officers were present, and with one or two exceptions they were all heartily in accord with the transfer proposition. They are limited in the duties they perform for the Coast Guard, and they are only occupied a part of the time during the year.

During the winter season they are busy and on the alert, but during the rest of the year they have nothing to do. I have had resolutions from California and from chambers of commerce in Washington indorsing this transfer. The Great Lakes people, or the business men there, are favorable to this transfer, because they know the Navy would perform the duties to better advantage than the Coast Guard can, as it is now limited. Now, Mr. Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy, would like to see the Coast Guard taken over by the Navy, but Mr. Glass, the Secretary of the Treasury, does not approve it, because there seems to be this disposition to convert each department

into a little kingdom or autocracy, and they do not want to give up anything they have. Senator McCormick, of Illinois, introduced a resolution in the Senate taking the Coast Guard Service and some other things from the Treasury Department. The Coast Guard officers claim a military status, yet they are in a civil branch of the Government, or the Treasury Department, where they ought not to be.

Mr. DEWALT. What is the concrete objection of the Secretary of the Treasury to the transfer of the Coast Guard Service to the Navy Department?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, it is mostly traditional. I had a letter from Mr. Glass to that effect, and it was put in the hearings. Three former assistant secretaries of the Treasury who had to do with the Coast Guard Service when they occupied that position have written me letters indorsing the bill and saying that it would be a good thing for the service if it were amalgamated with the Navy.

Mr. DEWALT. Did not some naval officers testify that they thought it would be a good thing? Did not one or two admirals testify that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; Admiral McKean, who had charge of the Bureau of Operations, testified to that effect. When the matter was put up to Mr. Glass, he had just assumed his duties as Secretary of the Treasury, and he then had an open mind; but, as I have said, it is mostly a matter of tradition that he holds to on that.

I renew my request that you consider this bill favorably.

Mr. STINESS. I would like to ask Capt. Reynolds how cadets are appointed at the New London institution.

Capt. REYNOLDS. By competitive examinations throughout the country, which are open to anybody of the required age who can pass the examination.

Mr. STINESS. These cadets are required to put up a sum of money before they can enter the Coast Guard school?

Capt. REYNOLDS. They put up a sufficient amount to pay for their first outfit and books.

Mr. STINESS. How much is that?

Capt. REYNOLDS. \$150.

Mr. STINESS. At Annapolis it is \$300.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I do not know about that. It used to be \$150.

Mr. STINESS. Unless the cadet at the New London Academy puts up \$150 he can not be appointed, can he?

Capt. REYNOLDS. No, sir; I do not think there is any way of overcoming that. But I have never known of a case where one was debarred on that account, because they are always able to get somebody to put it up for them if they have not the amount themselves.

Mr. STINESS. I had a case this week where a young man could not raise \$300 in order to go to Annapolis. He passed his mental and physical examination, but he was obliged to stay out because he could not raise \$300. I did not know whether that was the case at New London or not. How many cadets are there at New London?

Capt. REYNOLDS. There are 24 now. There are 22 actually at the academy and 2 are off.

STATEMENT OF SENIOR CAPT. D. P. FOLEY, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD.

Capt. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to correct, if I may, a statement by Mr. Cambell that the senior captains in the service are in favor of transfer to the Navy. I am one of the senior captains in the Coast Guard, and I am not in favor of transfer to the Navy, and I have never been in favor of it. I am not in favor of it, because I do not believe that the service can be administered as economically or as efficiently as it is under the Treasury Department. Mr. Campbell also referred to the fact that we have now under contract five vessels, to cost about \$3,500,000; that the building of those vessels would not be necessary if we should be transferred to the Navy, because the Navy has vessels which would do our work just as well. I may state that recently we asked the Navy Department to transfer to the Coast Guard for duty on the Great Lakes three of their mine sweepers. We have now one vessel of our own on the lakes and will have another in the spring, but we have only those two, one actual and the other prospective, and we wanted three more.

Notwithstanding that the Navy Department had decided a few days before the Coast Guard was returned to the Treasury Department by Executive order to place five vessels on the Great Lakes for the purpose of protecting and aiding the maritime interests, and to save life and property, work that comes particularly within the scope of Coast Guard operations, it answered that it could not give us the vessels we asked for for the same purpose. Now, I know that it is a fact that during the war, although the Navy claimed that it had vessels that could do our work, it utilized largely only our own vessels in rendering assistance to vessels in distress on the coast and in searching for them. They did not send any of those mythical ships which they claim to have to do our work during the war. The *Gresham* was overworked, and so were the other vessels of ours that did not go to the other side. I also believe that it would be very difficult for Mr. Campbell to prove that there would be a saving of \$1,500,000 by transferring this service to the Navy. I have not the figures with me, but I do know this, that Commodore Bertholf disproved that statement, or, rather, he made a statement which was to the contrary.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did Capt. Bertholf disprove it by figures?

Capt. FOLEY. He submitted figures.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did not the analysis that was made of those figures show some inaccuracies?

Capt. FOLEY. I did not see your analysis of them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Navy furnished some figures and analyzed Capt. Bertholf's statement regarding the Coast Guard Service, and that analysis showed that in the repair of vessels he did not charge salaries and wages against the repairs, or all the overhead. Is it not true that Capt. Bertholf did not include in his figures all of the cost of operating the Coast Guard?

Capt. FOLEY. I can not answer that question, because I am not posted on that matter, but I am inclined to think that at our Coast Guard depot where we repair vessels the overhead charges are included in the cost of the repairs.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You do not have as large a personnel as the Navy. You do not have the same number of men in the Coast Guard that you have in the Navy, do you?

Capt. FOLEY. We have a much smaller number of men on our vessels, and that is one reason why we can operate them more economically.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If naval vessels were performing coast guard duty they would be operated with the same personnel that the Coast Guard Service now employs.

Capt. FOLEY. It could be, of course, but they are not in the habit of doing it that way. It is not their custom.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Captain, you know the feeling among the officers of the Coast Guard Service, and many of them favor the transfer, do they not?

Capt. FOLEY. I think the junior officers generally favor the transfer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you call Capt. Cantwell a junior officer?

Capt. FOLEY. No, sir; he is a senior officer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is Capt. Ridgley a junior officer?

Capt. FOLEY. No, sir; Capt. Ridgley is not a junior officer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the motive that prompts the junior officers to favor the transfer?

Capt. FOLEY. I will tell you what I think it is: In accordance with the law which was passed during the war our officers were promoted with running mates in the Navy, so that most, if not all, of our second lieutenants have now the rank of captain in the service, which is the same as lieutenant commander in the Navy. If we remain with the Treasury Department those officers, not later than six months after peace is declared, must go back to their former grades. They have not told me so, but I think that is one reason why they favor transfer to the Navy. If the service goes to the Navy they will retain those grades.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not necessarily. They might be advanced.

Capt. FOLEY. I understand that necessarily they would, because the Navy will increase, and that the naval officers themselves will hold their present ranks. Our men, of course, would hold their temporary ranks, but they would be made permanent.

Mr. STINESS. As a matter of fact, do you know that there are over 2,000 resignations that have been presented to the Navy Department, and that the Navy Department has refused to accept them?

Capt. FOLEY. I do not know the number, but I understand that a great number of officers in the Navy want to get out. They want to get out because they claim they can not live on their present pay. I believe it is almost impossible for the people in our service and the people in the Navy to live on their present pay in the way in which they are expected to live.

Mr. STINESS. Is it an inducement for persons to join the Coast Guard that for a part of the year the surfmen are allowed to cultivate little farms and live near the scene of their occupation in the winter time? Does not that tend to make them prefer the Coast Guard Service, because if they were in the Navy they might be sent to China or any other place?

Capt. FOLEY. Yes, sir; the men at our Coast Guard stations are as a general thing home men. They are men who were born on the

coast and who have lived on the coast, and they prefer to live there. At many of our stations our people live in little homes within 100 or 200 yards of the station, and they have their wives and children there.

Mr. STINESS. Are you familiar with the coast at Narragansett Pier and Point Judith?

Capt. FOLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STINESS. I am informed that the men at the stations up there have little farms within a couple of miles of the stations.

Capt. FOLEY. Yes, sir; many of them have. The men who were in the former Life-Saving Service, the men in our present stations, are not in favor of going on board ships. They are not the rovers sailors are.

Mr. STINESS. They have a better opportunity to educate their children?

Capt. FOLEY. Their opportunities for educating their children are not so good on the coast because the schools are at some distance. At a great many places where there are four, five, or six families around a station they employ private tutors. The educational opportunities are not so good.

There is one other point I would like to make: Mr. Campbell stated that there is only one season of the year in which the coast guard is employed or busily employed—I did not just catch his words—but I must differ from him on that. There is no time during the year when our vessels are not cruising, or when they are not called upon to render assistance to some vessel in distress. Our stations on the Atlantic coast are closed during June and July, or were so closed before the war, for economical reasons, and because of the mildness of the weather fewer casualties occur in those two months, and most of our stations on the Great Lakes are closed during the winter months; but in all the other months of the year our stations are open, and in all months of the year our vessels are cruising. It is true that in winter they are cruising under more stringent orders. They are under what we call winter cruising orders, and they are looking then more particularly for vessels in distress. But there are vessels in distress at all seasons of the year, and at all times our ships are called out and are cruising, whether they are called out or not.

Mr. DEWALT. By reason of this advance in rank of the junior officers in the Coast Guard during the period of the war, I understood you to say that if the Coast Guard were to be transferred to the Navy Department those junior officers in all probability would retain their ranks thus obtained?

Capt. FOLEY. Yes, sir; that is my understanding.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, roughly speaking, how many officers would that affect, or what percentage of the entire personnel of the regular Coast Guard Service?

Capt. FOLEY. I should say, roughly, that it would affect 60 or 70 per cent of the officers.

Mr. DEWALT. Therefore, it is your opinion that that is the incentive for the approval of this transfer to the Navy Department?

Capt. FOLEY. I would not like to say that, but I think that is one reason why the transfer would be agreeable to them. I think, however, that there are some officers who really believe in the transfer for itself and who would not be affected by that consideration.

Mr. DEWALT. Captain, how long have you been in the Coast Guard Service?

Capt. FOLEY. Forty years.

Mr. DEWALT. During that 40 years of experience, you are of the opinion that it would be better for the Coast Guard to remain under the supervision of the Treasury Department?

Capt. FOLEY. I think so.

Mr. DEWALT. From an economical standpoint, from an efficiency standpoint, and from the standpoint of morale.

Capt. FOLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STINESS. Captain, there has not been any increase in the salaries of the Coast Guard for a number of years, has there?

Capt. FOLEY. The last increase was in 1908, if we except the temporary increases authorized during the continuance of the war.

Mr. STINESS. Has the cost of living affected the coast guard as it has other people?

Capt. FOLEY. In the same way; yes, sir.

Mr. STINESS. Can you buy as much with your salary now as you could five or six years ago?

Capt. FOLEY. No, sir; not by a great deal.

Mr. STINESS. And on the pay you are now receiving are you able to live properly?

Capt. FOLEY. No, sir; I do not think our people are able to live as well.

Mr. STINESS. And even if you were placed in the condition of the people who are now in the Navy, receiving the same pay, would that be sufficient?

Capt. FOLEY. No, sir.

Mr. STINESS. You know about this bill No. 9240, increasing the pay of the officers 30 per cent and the enlisted men 50 per cent.

Capt. FOLEY. I have read the bill.

Mr. STINESS. Would it be necessary for you, in order to live properly, to have that increase and be in the same position as the Navy, if the bill should pass, do you think?

Capt. FOLEY. I think so, undoubtedly.

Mr. STINESS. Are you in favor of the passage of this bill?

Capt. FOLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SWEET. Is there anyone else here who desires to be heard on this matter at this time?

Mr. SJOBERG. I think, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in regard to the pay of the warrant officers of the Coast Guard.

STATEMENT OF MR. N. SJOBERG, BOATSWAIN, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD.

Mr. SWEET. Give your name and rank?

Mr. SJOBERG. N. Sjoberg, boatswain, United States Coast Guard, Baltimore, Md. I would like to have permission to read a short statement:

The pay as provided by Coast Guard regulations are totally inadequate to meet the steadily advancing prices in the necessities of life and happiness and the steady advancing pay increases for men of the same ability in private life either ashore or afloat.

The Coast Guard pay in the grade of boatswain is only \$60 to start with and \$75 after a probationary period of six months, the latter being the same pay as is now received by sailors manning our merchant ships, some of whom have no sea experience at all, but they fill a seaman's billet and draw the pay. Here I must state that all the money drawn is clear money. Not so with a warrant officer in the Coast Guard. He is forced to contribute toward the mess bill, which always amounts to \$10 a month. Then he always has an outstanding bill for new uniforms, which amounts to at least \$5 a month, not to mention laundry bills to be paid during the month, and other small items. After 5 years' service our pay is increased to \$82.50 a month; after 10 years' service the pay is increased to \$90 a month, or the equal pay as received by the boatswain on a merchant ship who in many a case may have but one year's experience or a little more at sea, and he has no mess bill to pay or is required to wear a special uniform, so the pay he draws is all clear money to him.

The writer of this letter has had the experience as a boatswain in the merchant service before joining the Coast Guard, and is therefore well versed with the requirements in both services; and I am going to state them in full so any person reading this letter will form his own opinion.

Requirement for boatswain in the merchant marine:

(a) A good sailorman, if possible, capable of handling a small deck force of from 6 to 14 men at the most under orders from the chief or second mate of the ship.

Requirements for a boatswain of the Coast Guard:

(a) He must be a long-service, permanently rated petty officer, with a first-class conduct record in sobriety, conduct, and ability in handling men, before his commanding officer recommends him for a warrant.

(b) He must be a first-class seaman, sailmaker, painter, having complete knowledge of sails, rigging, spars, and other gear about deck and in boats, able to handle boats under oars or sail in all kinds of weather and in handling a lifeboat in a surf.

(c) Able to instruct gun crews in the handling and firing of big guns and take charge of an Infantry landing force, and in all other drills held on ship and shore according to naval and Coast Guard regulations.

(d) He must be a good signalman, capable of sending and receiving signals by international code flags, semaphore, wigwag, and night blinker signals, and be conversant with storm signals as displayed by the Weather Bureau.

(e) He must be fully acquainted with the service regulations.

(f) Must know how to prepare an official letter or how to make a short report in writing; keep correct account of all stores received and expended, etc.

(g) He is responsible for the clean and seamanlike appearance of the ship, and must at all times keep himself in clean and neat uniform, take charge of all work going on about decks, see that the regulations regarding drills and work are strictly complied with by all members of the crew under him and report all infractions of discipline to the executive officer.

The above-mentioned requirements are extracted from the Coast Guard Regulations under chapter 36, article 4304; section (c), and therefore must be correct.

There are a few more requirements besides the ones mentioned above, but not published in the regulations, but which easily can be proven, and they are as follows

Rules of the road, rules for the prevention of collision at sea, the buoyage system of the United States, be able to stand a bridge watch at sea and a regular deck watch in port. In fact, perform any duty as performed by men holding a commission.

That all warrant officers of the Coast Guard have proven that they are able to perform all above mentioned duties has been fully demonstrated during the present war or when ever called upon to perform any of the various duties assigned to them ashore or afloat for I have heard nothing but praise so far, but that is all.

In regards of receiving the same promotion I will say that throughout this war the warrant officers of this service have been badly neglected, for shortly after war broke out all warrant officers of the Navy and Marine Corps were promoted to ensign or lieutenant respectively but the warrant officers of the Coast Guard remained where they stood and none received any promotion to this day, although many a one was called upon to perform duties which would have carried along promotion had we been in the Navy.

All commissioned officers of this service were promoted according to their length of service and given more important duties and assignments and the places vacated by them were filled by inexperienced naval reserve men with the rank from ensign to lieutenant, a highly patriotic lot of men eager to perform their duties assigned but totally inexperienced in performing them and the warrant officers on board ship had to perform their duties until they became more accustomed to their duties they had to perform, which proved them good old standbys, still not a voice was raised in the service to give them their due. Many a warrant officer took a special course in navigation or marine engineering and received a license from the U. S. Steamboat Inspection Service all the way up to chief mate and chief engineer. That proves that there are as good a lot of men in the ranks of warrant officers of the Coast Guard as there is in any other branch of naval service, and it is hard to understand for anybody outside the service why there has been such discrimination made against the warrant officers of the Coast Guard during the latest war, when anybody at all with the least seagoing experience were given a commission of some kind.

To make up for the past injustice Congress could not enact a better law at this time than to put the warrant officers of the Coast Guard on equal footing with warrant officers of the Navy by giving us the same pay, allowances, privileges, and promotions forever after the war.

I have a statement of the estimated expense of living at the present day.

Mr. SWEET. You can make that a part of your hearing and it will be printed with your statement.

Mr. SJOBERG. All right, sir.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Living expenses, per month, of family consisting of man, wife, and two children.

House rent.....	\$30. 01	Insurance.....	\$11. 00
Clothing.....	25. 00	Light.....	2. 50
Coal and wood.....	5. 36	Food.....	60. 00
Doctor and medicine.....	4. 00		
Lunch for man.....	4. 00	Total.....	149. 66
Car fare.....	7. 80		

Estimate of daily cost for family consisting of man, wife, and two children.

1 quart of milk.....	\$0. 16	Spices, etc.....	\$0. 01
1½ loaves of bread.....	. 21	Lard.....	. 07
Meat.....	. 60	Oleomargarine.....	. 06½
Potatoes.....	. 07	Flour.....	. 04
Coffee.....	. 04	Eggs.....	. 10
Tea.....	. 02	Cereal.....	. 04
Sugar.....	. 04½	Fruit.....	. 04
Ice.....	. 10		
Vegetables.....	. 25	Total.....	1. 86

Basing the above allowance on \$2 a day for food, leaves 14 cents a day for incidental expenses (for extra pint of milk for baby).

Prices of daily food in Baltimore markets.

Sugar.....pound..	\$0. 11	Flour.....pound..	\$0. 07½
Coffee.....do.....	. 42	Tea.....do.....	. 70
Potatoes.....bushel..	2. 25	Meat.....do.....	. 40
Pork.....pound.....	. 45	Bread.....do.....	. 14
Oleomargarine.....do.....	. 40	Milk.....quart.....	. 16
Lard.....do.....	. 32	Store eggs.....dozen..	. 56
Soup bone.....do.....	. 25	Brisket.....pound.....	. 18
Soap.....bar (\$ pound)..	. 08		

Coast Guard base pay, warrant officers, \$75 per month.

Navy base pay, warrant officers, \$125 per month.

The above is an itemized statement of expenses for family of four, including myself, wife, and two children.

N. SJOBERG,
Boatswain, United States Coast Guard.

Mr. N. SJOBERG:

Herewith is transmitted a list of expenses as they are at my home every month; it would be impossible for me to meet same if my grown children did not contribute to the up-keep of the home.

Rent for house.....	\$30. 00	Contributions to church and charities.....	\$12. 00
Food.....	120. 00	Car fare for myself and two school children.....	8. 60
Light.....	4. 00	Clothing and shoes and linen.....	30. 00
Gas for cooking.....	3. 50		
Coal for heating during winter...	6. 25	Total.....	243. 35
Laundry.....	6. 00		
Life insurance.....	22. 00		
Fraternal association.....	1. 00		

The above is an itemized statement of expenses for family of four, including myself, wife, and two children both of whom are going to school.

A. M. TOTZKE,
Master's Mate, United States Coast Guard.

Mr. DEWALT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. How long have you been in the service?

Mr. SJOBERG. Twenty-one years.

Mr. DEWALT. How long have you been boatswain?

Mr. SJOBERG. Fourteen years.

Mr. DEWALT. What is your pay now?

Mr. SJOBERG. The pay at the present time is \$182 a month.

Mr. DEWALT. If you do not get the provisions of this bill what would your pay be?

Mr. SJOBERG. \$97.50 on active duty. I unfortunately lost my leg and was retired under the disability clause and my retired pay was \$73.12 when I was retired.

Mr. DEWALT. Then, as I understand it, a boatswain who has been in the service as long as you have, in active service, would receive how much?

Mr. SJOBERG. With 20 years' service he will draw \$106 a month.

Mr. DEWALT. And if you do not get the provisions of this bill, what would it be?

Mr. SJOBERG. He will only draw \$106 for 20 years' service.

Mr. DEWALT. Take a quartermaster, for instance, what would his pay be at this time?

Mr. SJOBERG. About \$44 a month.

Mr. DEWALT. If he does not get the provisions of this bill, how much would the reduction be?

Mr. SJOBERG. There will not be any reduction. He can only receive in the Coast Guard \$44 a month, except at the present time he receives Navy pay.

Mr. DEWALT. What does he get now, \$44?

Mr. SJOBERG. Approximately \$46.50.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, take a yeoman. Do you know what he gets?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Capt. Jones can perhaps answer those questions more definitely than Mr. Sjoberg.

Capt. JONES. \$66 a month.

Mr. DEWALT. If this resolution goes not go through, what will he get?

Capt. JONES. \$60 a month.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Sjoberg, how long did you say you had been in the service?

Mr. SJOBERG. Twenty-one years.

Mr. DEWALT. Sometimes petty officers and seamen do not like to express opinions in the presence of their superior officers, and so you need not express any opinion if you do not want to, but I would like to know from you, as a seamen and a Coast Guard man, for all this length of time, what you think about this transfer of the Coast Guard to the Navy Department.

Mr. SJOBERG. My own personal opinion is that I think it will be a good thing for the Coast Guard if the transfer is made.

Mr. DEWALT. Why?

Mr. SJOBERG. Because, the first thing, they would get larger appropriations.

Mr. DEWALT. I mean leaving pay out of consideration.

Mr. SJOBERG. Outside of the pay, to a certain extent I think they have more chances to have the ships repaired and have a larger crew on the station and a larger crew on board the ship. At the present time, at a life-saving station particularly, the crew is too short to man the boats, and aboard a ship, those ships are only approximately 1,000 tons, and the same ships in the Navy carry about 135 or 140 men, while our complement is approximately 70 men.

Mr. DEWALT. That has to do with efficiency. What do you say about what they call the morale of the service. Do you think it would be better for the morale of the service to have it transferred

to the Navy Department or to leave it under the Treasury Department and under the supervision of the captain commandant and the senior captains.

Mr. SJOBERG. Well, in the Coast Guard a young man goes in between 18 or 20 years of age, and at about 28 or 30 or 35 he becomes a warrant officer. He has no further chance to go higher. He will stand still like a rotten tree for 35 or 40 years. If you have 30 years of service you will stay at the grade attained with no chances of promotion whatever.

Mr. DEWALT. Why not?

Mr. SJOBERG. There is no provision provided for that in the Coast Guard regulations.

Mr. DEWALT. There is no chance of instruction aboard ship and for promotion by examination?

Mr. SJOBERG. None whatever.

Mr. DEWALT. So that is one reason why you think they ought to go over in the Navy?

Mr. SJOBERG. In the Navy they have ways and means and schools to provide for promotion for the men. A man can go in the Navy and learn a trade. If he wants to be a clerk he can be a clerk or paymaster. If he wants to be a mechanic there are schools provided for him at which he can learn that. In the Coast Guard we have nothing of that kind. We learn as we go along. Most of our men are old seafaring men who come from the merchant marine. They like to stay close to shore and not make trips of two or three years, but to-day we can not get any seamen, not with the pay provided.

Mr. DEWALT. Boatswain, is there some talk among the men in the Coast Guard, the enlisted men and petty officers, as to this transfer over to the Navy Department? Do you hear it talked about?

Mr. SJOBERG. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Have you formed an opinion as to what their sentiment is with regard to this matter, and if you have, do you want to tell it?

Mr. SJOBERG. In the younger generation they are mostly in favor of a transfer to the Navy. We have men with 20 or 30 or 35 years of service who still like to stick to the old Coast Guard, and that is natural. A man who has been 15 or 20 or 30 years in a service, naturally, will like to stick to the same service and not change, on account of the old saying that you can not learn an old dog new tricks. With the younger generation, where promotion is provided for them, it is natural that they like to go up. A man, it does not make any difference from what station of life he comes, likes to have a way to improve his condition and likes to go up, but we have no such provisions in the Coast Guard.

Mr. DEWALT. I take it from what you say, and if I am not correct you may correct me, that, regardless of the increase in pay, the men believe that it would afford them better chances if they were transferred to the Navy Department than if they remained under the supervision of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SJOBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENISON. All of the reasons you have given why you think this transfer would be better are based on benefits to the men?

Mr. SJOBERG. It is based on benefits to the men.

Mr. DENISON. I want your judgment as to whether or not it would improve the Coast Guard Service any to transfer it to the Navy Department.

Mr. SJOBERG. To a certain extent.

Mr. DENISON. Explain why.

Mr. SJOBERG. If it is provided that when they turn it over to the Navy Department, or amalgamate it with the Navy, that when the Navy needs men at the stations they must put on men who know the shoals, who know the tides, and the different outlets and inlets along the coast, and know the weather conditions along the coast, or if they leave the men who are at the stations, and I do believe they will, the service will be good. It takes almost a lifetime to know the tides and the shoals around the stations. If they should take men away from the Coast Guard stations, it would not benefit the Coast Guard Service.

Mr. DENISON. We do not know whether they would or not. We do not know what they will do with the service when they get it. Do you not think we would be taking chances on that?

Mr. SJOBERG. Chances would be taken on that part.

Mr. DENISON. You do not know what the Navy would do with it after they got it. They could send those men at the stations up and down the Shantung coast, if they wanted to.

Mr. SJOBERG. That may be.

Mr. DENISON. What did you say your rank was?

Mr. SJOBERG. Boatswain.

Mr. DENISON. If you do not mind stating what are the different names or designations of the officers in the Coast Guard Service, and of the men, I would be glad if you would.

Mr. SJOBERG. Well, we have boatswains, gunners, carpenters, machinists, and sailmakers in the warrant grades. We have no petty officers in the service that have the rating of chief petty officer, but we have men in the service who perform the corresponding duties of chief petty officer in the Navy. That grade was not established in the Coast Guard.

Mr. DENISON. What are the privates called?

Mr. SJOBERG. The privates would be seamen and ordinary seamen.

Mr. DENISON. What do they do? Do they go out and man the boats?

Mr. SJOBERG. They do any kind of work they are called upon to perform.

Mr. DENISON. What did they get before the war, or what was their pay?

Mr. SJOBERG. It was \$36 before the war and \$44 now.

Mr. DENISON. What would they get if this resolution does not pass?

Mr. SJOBERG. \$36 per month. If this resolution is passed that will give them a chance to get what they have in the Navy for long service. That is, if a man has three or four years' service, he will receive more pay than he receives now in the Coast Guard.

Mr. DENISON. Could the condition of the men in the Coast Guard Service be improved if the regulations were changed or liberalized so that the men would get a chance at promotion? Could the conditions be improved any by changing the regulations?

Mr. SJOBERG. It could be done by changing the regulations.

I would like to discuss another question: This resolution does not take care of the retired man in the service. In my case, when I have my order to go back to the retired status my pay will be \$73.12 per month.

Mr. SWEET. That is three-fourths of \$97.60 per month.

Mr. SJOBERG. It will be three-fourths pay. I do not know whether my two years' service during the war will entitle me to \$7.50 more. If it does, it would be \$78 per month.

Mr. SWEET. That is the same proposition that was raised by Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. SJOBERG. The condition at the present time is such that my standing expenses average approximately \$149 per month. I have a wife and two children, and I know we do not live extravagantly. When I go to the retired status my pay will be \$73.12 per month, or it may be \$78 per month, and on this we will have to do the best we can to struggle along.

Mr. SWEET. Do you believe there should be some amendment to this resolution providing additional pay for retired men and officers?

Mr. SJOBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. SWEET. You think that it should be increased?

Mr. SJOBERG. If a proviso is made to that effect, or if this increase of pay is granted, it should extend equally to the men on the retired list. I have in mind a man who was retired during the present emergency, and after being on the retired list for five or six months he received a notice to return the difference between the retirement pay of the Navy and the retirement pay of the Coast Guard. He was retired on the Navy pay. This one man in particular told me so. I have not his statement with me, but he told me that he received that notification, that he did not have the money to return to the Treasury, and that the amount was taken off of his retirement pay at the rate of \$12 per month to pay back to the Treasury Department the amount that was overpaid, or the difference between the Coast Guard retirement pay and the naval retirement pay. That was a case almost of starvation. I know of another case at Baltimore in which the man had to return six or seven hundred dollars.

Mr. DEWALT. Your suggestion is that the retirement pay ought to be based upon your present naval pay, and that if this resolution passes, the retirement pay ought to be based upon the pay that is obtained by virtue of this resolution instead of upon your previous pay?

Mr. SJOBERG. I mean that those men who have been or may be retired for physical disability or for length of service, or after reaching 64 years of age, should be beneficiaries of the pay provided by this resolution.

Mr. DEWALT. You do not want the resolution to apply only to those now in the service and who will be retired, or who really were retired and called back into the service, but you want it to apply to the men who have been retired in the past?

Mr. SJOBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. SWEET. Capt. Reynolds, do you see any objection to this resolution being amended so as to take care of retired men and officers?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I would like to see the retired men and officers taken care of, and my understanding is that they will be amply taken care of in the bill which Mr. Stiness has up now. We do not desire to load up this joint resolution with that. We are satisfied that the bill that Mr. Stiness has introduced, in the event it shall pass in some shape or other, will be of benefit to all concerned.

Mr. SWEET. Would that apply to the men who have been retired previously?

Capt. REYNOLDS. I understand that it will. I would not put anything in the way of those officers and men who are going out. I do not want to be placed in that attitude here, and it is simply because we do not desire to overload this joint resolution that I make that statement. We hope you can pass it soon, and we thought that we could get quicker action on this resolution if it were not encumbered any more than it is now.

Mr. SWEET. If this resolution should pass, there is nothing in what is known as the Stiness bill that would interfere with its provisions. They are in harmony, are they not?

Capt. REYNOLDS. They are in perfect harmony. There is a legal question as to whether, or not, this Joint Resolution, if passed, would apply to those at present on the retired list, but if it should be decided that it does not apply to them, they will be taken care of in the bill produced by Mr. Stiness.

Mr. DEWALT. Are you sure of that?

Mr. STINESS. This joint resolution would place the Coast Guard in exactly the same position as the Navy?

Capt. REYNOLDS. At the present time and would continue it so.

Mr. STINESS. It would place them in exactly the position of the Navy?

Capt. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STINESS. This bill, H. R. 9204, reads:

That the base pay of all officers, active and retired, of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service be, and the same is hereby, increased 30 per centum per annum, and the pay of all enlisted men, active and retired, is hereby increased 50 per centum.

Therefore, as you will see, if this bill should pass it would place them in the same status as the Navy. Then if the pay of the Navy should be increased, they would be increased in the same way. This covers retired men in the Navy, and the retired men in the Coast Guard would get the same pay as though retired in the same positions in the Navy.

Mr. DEWALT. Let us see how it would work out: John Jones was retired in 1912, and when he retired he was a member of the Coast Guard. As I understand it, he would get three-fourths of his active pay.

Mr. STINESS. Coast Guard pay.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, by the provisions of your bill the retired pay would be increased 30 per cent.

Mr. STINESS. If he were an officer. The pay of the enlisted man would be increased 50 per cent.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, would not that 50 per cent be calculated upon his retired pay as of the date of his retirement?

Mr. STINESS. I think not, and I will give you my authority. Those hearings have been going on since last Wednesday, and Admiral

Washington and Admiral Sims have given very full testimony. Unless I am very much mistaken they have shown that if this bill is passed they will get, in the case of officers, a 30 per cent increase on their retired pay, and, in the case of enlisted men, a 50 per cent increase on their retired pay.

Mr. DEWALT. You do not quite catch my thought. Take this instance: John Jones belongs to the Coast Guard, and he retired in 1912; he received on his retirement three-fourths of his pay as then existing in 1912.

Now, his pay by the provisions of this bill if he were in the service would be increased. Your bill provides that he shall get 50 per cent of his retired pay. Does that 50 per cent increase apply to the pay as of the date when he was retired or does it apply as to the increase which he has obtained by this joint resolution?

Capt. REYNOLDS. If that is so, then it does not meet the purpose those gentlemen have in view.

Mr. SWEET. The percentage would be figured on the amount he received as of the date of retirement.

Mr. DEWALT. And not by the provisions of this joint resolution, and that is what we would not like to see. I would like to see them get the benefit of the whole business.

Capt. REYNOLDS. We can remedy that by amending it.

Mr. SWEET. Would you prepare an amendment that might meet that situation and put it in the hearing.

Capt. REYNOLDS. I would insert the words "on the active and retired list."

Mr. DEWALT. Whereabouts?

Capt. REYNOLDS. At the end of line 3, in joint resolution 189, which we are considering here. Line 3 would read then; if I include the other amendment about the commissioned officers "that commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men on the active and retired lists of the United States Coast Guard shall receive," etc. That will eliminate any possibility of a doubt.

Mr. STINESS. And do no harm if it did no good. I think it would be a pretty good thing if a man had \$1,000 pay and we increased it to \$1,500; 50 per cent increase.

Mr. SWEET. Gentlemen, this closes the hearing for this morning.

(Thereupon, at 12.10 o'clock p. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

(Communications submitted by Captain-Commandant W. E. Reynolds.)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,
Washington, October 17, 1919.

HON. JOHN J. ESCH,
*Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. ESCH: I am returning herewith typewritten copy of my testimony before the committee on October 14.

The draft of the resolution in typewritten form, which is inclosed, is intended simply to show clearly where the amendments should be inserted that I asked the committee to adopt.

During the hearing reference was made by members of the committee to certain cases of retired warrant officers. If the committee deem proper, these cases may be taken care of by inserting at the end of line 3 (of the printed resolution), after the word "men," a comma and the words "active and retired." It is important that the comma be placed after the word "men."

Very truly, yours,

W. E. REYNOLDS,
Captain Commandant.

JOINT RESOLUTION To equalize the pay and allowances of *commissioned officers*, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard shall receive the same pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be prescribed for corresponding grades or ratings and length of service in the Navy; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fix and determine the several grades and ratings for warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men of the Coast Guard: Provided, That the senior district superintendent, the three district superintendents next in order of seniority, the four district superintendents next below these three in order of seniority, and the junior five district superintendents shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, and third lieutenant in the Coast Guard, respectively: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall operate to reduce the pay or allowances that would have been received by any person in the Coast Guard except for the passage of this resolution.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED COAST COAST GUARD,
Washington, October 27, 1919.

HON. BURTON E. SWEET,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SWEET: Replying to your letter of October 24, I take pleasure in sending you herewith tabulations showing the number of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, active and retired, in the Coast Guard on October 20, and giving the increased cost that will be occasioned by the enactment of H. J. Res. 189, if amended as suggested.

In accordance with the request contained in your letter, there is also inclosed a statement of the further increase in cost, in so far as the Coast Guard is concerned, that will be caused if H. R. 9204 is enacted subsequent to the passage of H. J. Res. 189, with proposed amendments. If you desire any further information or additional statistics, kindly advise me, and your request will be promptly complied with.

I very much hope that, in reporting the resolution, the committee will see fit to include the amendment suggested at the hearing, namely, in line 7, after the word "Navy," insert the words: "and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fix and determine the several grades and ratings for warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men of the Coast Guard."

The authority that this amendment is intended to give is greatly needed in the interest of the most efficient and economical administration.

Very truly, yours,

W. E. REYNOLDS,
Captain Commandant.

Personnel of the Coast Guard.

On October 20, 1919, there were in the Coast Guard on the active list: Commissioned officers, 220; cadets, 26; warrant officers, 432; petty officers and enlisted men, 4,040; total, 4,718. On October 20, 1919, there were in the Coast Guard on the retired list: Commissioned officers, 54; warrant officers, 144; petty officers and enlisted men, 297; total, 495. The total personnel of the Coast Guard, active and retired was 5,213.

Total increase of cost occasioned by H. J. R. 189, if amended as suggested by Secretary of the Treasury in his letter of September 9, 1919:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Sea pay, 10 per cent for duty at sea.....	\$49,000.00
District superintendents, increase of rank, pay.....	2,040.00
District superintendents, quarters.....	5,616.00
District superintendents, heat and light.....	2,509.00
Total increase for above.....	\$59,165.00

WARRANT OFFICERS.

Coast Guard peace rate:		
Pay and longevity.....	\$581, 240. 00	
Quarters.....	4, 920. 00	
Total.....	586, 160. 00	
Naval rate:		
Pay and longevity.....	913, 910. 00	
Quarters.....	9, 840. 00	
Heat and light.....	6, 396. 00	
Total.....	930, 146. 00	
Total increase for above.....		\$343, 986. 00

PETTY OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN.

Coast Guard base pay.....	\$2, 801, 186. 00	
Coast Guard allowances:		
Longevity.....	147, 946. 00	
Clothing allowance.....	120, 000. 00	
Commutation of quarters, detached duty.....	5, 760. 00	
Commutation of rations, detached duty.....	13, 840. 00	
Total.....	3, 088, 732. 00	
Base pay under H. J. R. 189.....	3, 153, 212. 00	
Navy allowances:		
Continuous service.....	43, 000. 00	
Reenlistment pay (native born).....	144, 000. 00	
Honorable discharge gratuity.....	140, 000. 00	
Clothing allowance.....	108, 000. 00	
Subsistence, men on detached duty.....	35, 000. 00	
Total.....	3, 623, 212. 00	
Total increase for above.....		534, 480. 00

In addition to the above, a number of allowances are available in the Navy as (per month):

Certificates of qualification as steward or cook.....	\$5. 00
Good conduct medal.....	. 75
Seaman in charge of hold.....	5. 00
Coxswains of steam launches.....	5. 00
Divers, service as, \$1.20 per hour under water.....	
Duty in fireroom, seamen, and seamen second class, \$0.33 per day.....	
Gun pointers, secondary guns, first class.....	4. 00
Gun pointers, secondary guns, second class.....	2. 00
Jacks of the dust, lamplighters, etc.....	5. 00
Navy mail clerk.....	10. 00
Messmen.....	5. 00
Signalmen, first class.....	3. 00
Signalmen, second class.....	2. 00
Signalmen, third class.....	1. 00
Detention after expiration of enlistment, $\frac{1}{2}$ pay additional.....	
Credits, gratuity for heroism.....	
Credits, prizes, etc.....	

From the nature of the above allowances, it is impossible to estimate with exactness, the total increase in cost involved. The total increase, however, due to these allowances will not exceed..... 22, 000. 00

Total increase of cost..... 959, 631. 00

INCREASE OF PAY FOR THE COAST GUARD.

If H. J. R. 189 is also amended by inserting after the word "men" in line 3, the words "on the active and retired lists" as suggested in Hearings (p. —), additional cost will be as follows:

Commissioned officers.....	
Warrant officers.....	\$84,000
Petty officers and enlisted men.....	22,000
Total.....	106,000
	<u>\$106,000.00</u>

Total cost of resolution with amendment to include retired list.. 1,065,631.00

Figures listed above are based on the number of commissioned officers, warrant officers and enlisted men, carried in the estimate for 1920.

If H. J. resolution 189, with amendments suggested, be enacted, and the bill H. R. 9204 be subsequently enacted, the additional cost occasioned by H. R. 9204 will be:

Active list:	
Commissioned officers.....	\$214,101.00
Warrant officers.....	274,173.00
Petty officers and enlisted men.....	1,576,606.00
	<u>\$2,064,880.00</u>
Retired list:	
Commissioned officers.....	51,363.00
Warrant officers.....	74,745.90
Petty officers and enlisted men.....	106,807.50
	<u>232,916.40</u>
Total.....	<u>2,297,796.40</u>

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,
Washington, October 29, 1919.

HON. BURTON E. SWEET,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR Mr. SWEET: Referring to my letter of October 27, transmitting certain data for the consideration of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with H. J. Res. 189, I am inclosing statement that I should like to have brought to the attention of the committee and appended to the tabulation to be printed in the hearings, if time permits its being included. You will note that 46 per cent—nearly half—of the enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard are "period of the war" men. Under the terms of their enlistments these men are entitled to their discharges not later than three months after the proclamation of peace. Unless H. J. Res. 189 be enacted, these men will not reenlist and we can not fill their places. That will mean that we can not operate our units.

I am confident that this statement will impress you and the other members of the committee with the great urgency of the situation that confronts us.

Very truly, yours,

W. E. REYNOLDS,
Captain Commandant.

NOTE.—Of the enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard, 1,918, or 46 per cent of the total enlisted force, are serving under "period of the war" enlistments, and must be discharged not later than three months after peace is proclaimed. The Coast Guard will thus lose nearly half its enlisted personnel. Unless remedial legislation such as provided in H. J. Res. 189 be enacted, it will be impossible to fill the places of the men thus discharged, with the result that a number of ships and stations can not be operated. Furthermore, it is urgently necessary that this legislation be promptly enacted in order to stimulate recruiting and forestall this large exodus of personnel that will otherwise inevitably occur.

C.1

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 045 423 881

[illegible]

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004

